



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/527,235

11/30/2005

Majid Shahbazi

039996-001000

9977

22204

7590

07/11/2008

NIXON PEABODY, LLP

401 9TH STREET, NW

SUITE 900

WASHINGTON, DC 20004-2128

EXAMINER

NOBAHAR, ABDULHAKIM

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2132

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/11/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/527,235	Applicant(s) SHAHBAZI, MAJID	
	Examiner ABDULHAKIM NOBAHAR	Art Unit 2132	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 February 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 33-61 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 33-61 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to applicants' amendment filed on 02/28/2008.
2. Claims 33-61 are pending.
3. Claims 47-61 newly added.
4. Claims 33 and 43 are amended.
5. Applicant's arguments with respect to rejections under 35 USC § 103 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant on page 8 of the remarks argues that Sharma discloses the use of a basic "network discovery function" which merely browses the network to discover the existing network topology and Albert discloses a system for regulating access at a computing system or device as required for connection of a device to a network. Furthermore, on page 9 of the remarks applicant argues that *generally, Nordstrom discloses a discovery utility that allows an operating system (OS) of a distributed computer system, such as a system area network (SAN), to be notified whenever a new component (node or device) is added to the SAN. The invention is also applicable to discovery of previously connected devices that were in the OS database but have been removed from the network for one reason or another.* Thus, according to Nordstrom, the discovery of "previously connected devices" relates to devices that "have been removed from the network." Applicant, finally, concludes that "In contrast to the above teachings, the present claims provide a discovery program is used to 1) detect mobile

devices or resources on the network that are connected to the computing node, and 2) detect mobile devices or resources on the network that were previously, but are not currently, connected to the computing node.”

Examiner respectfully disagrees and asserts that Sharma discloses systems and methods of providing mobile network management of assets on the network. In accordance with an example of the method, a network management server is provided to control a network asset on a network (see, for example,[0010]). Sharma further discloses that the NMS (network management server) 400 network discovery function is carried out by the network discovery process 426. The network discovery process 426 communicates with the network via the I/O interface 402 to browse the network to discover the existing network topology. The network topology preferably serves as a schematic or blueprint of the assets present on the network, and may include the NMS. Thus, Sharma discloses a system that discovers (i.e., detects) the existing assets (e.g., mobile devices) on the network which corresponds to “detect mobile devices or resources on the network that are connected to the computing node” as recited in claim 33.

Nordstrom discloses a method and system are provided for dynamically informing an OS of a distributed computer system, when a (new) device is added on the network. The invention is thus applicable to a distributed computing system, such as a system area network, having end nodes, switches, and routers, and links interconnecting these components (see, e.g., col. 1, lines 61-67) and its subnet manager periodically sweeps the network to search for and discover new components (see, e.g., col. 2, lines 18-21).

Nordstrom further discloses that his invention is also applicable to discovery of previously connected devices (corresponding to the recited detect mobile devices or resources that were previously on the network) that were in the OS database but have been removed from the network for one reason or another (corresponding to the recited but are not currently, connected to the computing node) (see, e.g., col. 2, lines 65-67). Therefore, Nordstrom discloses an invention that “detects mobile devices or resources on the network that were previously, but are not currently, connected to the computing node.”

However, combination of Sharma and Nordstrom teachings alone without Albert meet the abovementioned two limitations of claim 33.

2. Examiner, however, in light of the above submission maintains the previous rejections while considering the amendments to the claim 33 and newly added claims as follows:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 33-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sharma et al (2002/0068559 A1; hereinafter Sharma) in view of Albert et al

(2003/0177389 A1; hereinafter Albert) and further in view of Nordstrom et al (7,136,907 B1; hereinafter Nordstrom).

Regarding claims 33 and 47, Sharma discloses:

A method for managing a computer system on a network, the computer system including a computing node located on the network side of a network connection on the network and one or more mobile devices located on a user's side of the network connection on the network (see, for example, abstract; [0010]-[0012]), comprising:

Detecting, using a discovery program, one or more mobile devices or resources on the network that are connected to the computing node (see, for example, [0061]-[0062]; [0066]-[0067]);

determining information regarding one or more mobile devices or resources based on at least one of a registry resource, a file resource, a process resource, a network management parameter, a data format, a packet format, a synchronization log entry, a directory structure, a database entry, the presence of an executable program and attributes associated with a mobile device or resource (see, for example, [0020]; [0039]; [0047]; [0064]).

Sharma, however, does not expressly disclose:

using the determined mobile device information for managing security of the computer system from the network side of the network connection.

Albert discloses:

using the determined mobile device information to manage security of the computer system from the network side of the network connection (see, for example, Figs. 3 & 4; [0024]; [0071]-[0072]).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement in the system of Sharma, a mechanism to use the information of a mobile device connecting to the network to manage the security of a computer system as taught in Albert, because it would be helpful to regulate access to a computer system (Albert, [0024]).

Sharma in view of Albert does not expressly disclose that detecting, using a discovery program, one or more mobile devices or resources on the network that were previously, but are not currently, connected to the computing node.

Nordstrom discloses a system for dynamically informing an operating system of a distributed computer system, when a (new) device is added on the network (col. 1, lines 60-67; col. 2, lines 18-21). Nordstrom also discloses that the invented system is capable of discovering a device that has previously been connected to the network (col. 2, lines 60-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement in the system of Sharma in view of Albert, a scheme to also detect the devices that have been connected to network previously as taught in Nordstrom, because the information about the devices that have been connected to the network at a time period in the past could be used in the evaluation and management of the computing system security.

Regarding claims 34 and 48, Sharma discloses:

The method of claim 33 further including scanning the computer system based on a scan profile to detect the one or more mobile devices (see, for example, [0021], where the configuration data corresponds to the recited profile; [0027]; [0113]).

Regarding claims 35 and 49, Sharma discloses:

The method of claim 33, wherein the discovery program is run in at least one of a remote central station or a local computing node (see, for example, [0010]; [0091]).

Regarding claims 36 and 50, Sharma discloses:

The method of claim 33 further including grouping the located mobile devices or resources by type and other attribute (see, for example, [0059]; [0062]).

Regarding claims 37 and 51, Sharma discloses:

The method of claim 34, wherein the scan profile contains information regarding at least one of network, domain, IP address, netmask, and computer identity to be scanned, time of synchronization and device connection (see, for example, [0076]).

Regarding claims 38 and 52, Sharma discloses:

The method of claim 34, wherein the scan profile contains information regarding at least one of network, domain, IP address, netmask, and computer identity not to be

scanned (see, for example, [0076]; [0090]; [0140]-[0141]).

Regarding claims 39 and 53, Sharma discloses:

The method of claim 34, wherein the results of scanning are analyzed and populated and stored and displayed to the users (see, for example, [0022]; [0034]; [0059]).

Regarding claims 40 and 54, Sharma discloses:

The method of claim 33, wherein the gather mobile device information include at least one of device type, device identity, synchronization software type, synchronization software availability, synchronization software location, synchronization software version number, previous synchronization information, data and time of last synchronization, the type of device used during previous synchronization, synchronization ID, device owner information, type of applications and files installed or used on the mobile device, file size, file name, file attribute, manufacturer information, time of all completed and incomplete synchronization and data access and connections performed, type of data and information transferred to and from a mobile device and a resource (see, for example, [0022]; [0030]; [0038]; [0059]; [0090]).

Regarding claims 41, 42, 55 and 56, Sharma discloses:

The method of claim 33, further comprising at least one of locking and denying access to an unauthorized mobile device attempting to access the computer

system (see, for example, [0007], lines 18-20; [0010]; [0024], where management of assets and devices implies that the security system also would block an unauthorized device(s) to connect to the network as it is a well known practice in the art; [0065]).

Regarding claims 43, 44 and 57-59, Sharma discloses:

The method of claim 42, wherein the locking step comprises transmitting security software to the mobile device (see [0004]; [0022]; [0044]; [0063]).

Regarding claims 45 and 60, Sharma discloses:

The method of claim 33, wherein the discovery program is run locally at the computing node (see [0027]; [0033]).

Regarding claims 46 and 61, Sharma discloses:

The method of claim 33, wherein the step of running the discovery program results in detection of at least one of a device type, connection profile, or location of at least one of the mobile devices and resource devices (see [0022]; [0058]; [0059]).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

Art Unit: 2132

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ABDULHAKIM NOBAHAR whose telephone number is (571)272-3808. The examiner can normally be reached on M-T 8-6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gilberto Barron can be reached on 571-272-3799. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system.

/Abdulkhakim Nobahar/
Examiner, Art Unit 2132

July 3, 2008

/Gilberto Barron Jr/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2132